

As this article by John Davenport points out, Government spending may be regarded as the flywheel of the economy, but it cannot supply the motive power. That motive power resides in the creative energies of the people, and the most Government can do is help to release it. Under unanimous consent, I include the article, as follows:

**THE PRIORITY OF POLITICS OVER ECONOMICS**  
(By John Davenport)

This month the anxiety that overhung the Nation's economy all through the summer will give way, at least momentarily, to the turbulence and excitement of a political campaign. Even as an off-year election, it will be an enormous expression of the national will: all the House seats (435) are at stake, 39 Senate seats, and 35 governorships. Parochial arguments in States and cities and the racket of personal political feuds will fill the air. But the man to whom the outcome will be most important, is the man who isn't running, President John F. Kennedy.

For while local issues will be mainly in the forefront, below the surface will always be the big, rocklike questions: the questions of jobs, of prices, of profits, of Government spending, of taxes. No one is more aware of this than the President, who is taking his case directly to hundreds of thousands of people, attempting to resell his various programs of medicare, urban renewal, and electric power expansion. It could be said that he began his campaign in August in his televised report on the economy. Then he found the economy good enough so that no immediate tax cut was needed. But he promised that in 1963 he will present a bill to Congress that will include an "across-the-board top-to-bottom cut in both corporate and personal income taxes," and will also include "long-needed tax reform that logic and equity demand." This promise of tax reduction obviously has enormous political appeal. It will also be one of the most bitterly debated issues in the new Congress that will be elected this fall.

For quite apart from their obvious and necessary function in government, taxes have become in the last quarter of a century an instrument of social welfare, a weapon of intervention in the economy, a pervasive factor in business decisions, and a demonstration of the intent and power of Washington, and it is impossible, of course, to separate tax reform from the issue of Federal spending. When Harry Hopkins said, "We shall spend and spend and tax and tax and elect and elect," he expressed a cynicism that must pervert and defeat any effort to remedy the tax structure. One test of John F. Kennedy's sincerity will be whether he has left this kind of cynicism behind.

But the greater test of the President's promise of tax reform and of his domestic policies turns on the question of whether he understands the nature of the American enterprise system and the unique system of government that has allowed enterprise to flourish. During the fifties, President Eisenhower clung to the salty philosophy that it was the function of Government to build the framework and to create the atmosphere in which business could prosper and so provide jobs and rising living standards. Ike was not too articulate in this belief; sometimes his metaphors about frames and atmosphere got pretty mixed. And in the end Federal expenditures got out of hand. Nevertheless, Eisenhower's attempt to delimit the functions of Government and relate them to the profit system was welcome and constructive after the Truman years. Now under John F. Kennedy there has been a "shift" in a different direction. How far has this shift gone? And, more important, on what kind of philosophy is it based?

**JAMES MADISON PUT THE QUESTION**

One paradox that must strike the inquirer at the beginning is that while Kennedy is the most politically minded of men when it comes to gathering votes, he has laid little emphasis on political theory as such. While doubtless an admirer of the Federalist papers, he has not in public, at least chewed over the great questions therein raised as to how a government, endowed with coercive power, can be prevented from misusing it and, in James Madison's phrase, can be obliged "to control itself." Nor does the President seem to have noted that to the architects of the republic, politics in the philosophic sense of the word had clear priority over what we today call economics. Because they took a certain view of man and his liberties, they favored strong but limited government, and in favoring such government, they more or less took for granted the virtues of a free economy. In a curious way the pragmatists and activists of our day have reversed this order of thinking. President Kennedy's politics seems to flow from his economics and his economics in turn forces the Government into a positive and expansive role.

Such expansion breathes through most of the multiple messages that the President has fired at Congress. It is also implicit in his constant talk of "moving America ahead." Under the elms of New Haven last June the President stated that the central problem of our time was "the practical management of the modern economy." And he then asked almost plaintively, "How, in sum, can we make our free economy work at full capacity—that is, provide adequate profits for enterprise, and adequate wages for labor, and adequate utilization of plant, and opportunity for all?" But who is the "we" of this strange, tortured question? And just how is a free economy to be made to do something? And is it really a prime function of such an economy to provide profits for enterprise? Surely matters are the other way around: in the right environment businessmen will as a matter of course seek a profit as the reward of risk taking and the producing of goods that the people demand, and this in turn will expand the economy.

**NEW EXPERTS FOR OLD PLANS**

Direct interference of the government in the economy is associated with another tendency—namely, reliance on "experts" and expertise. While calling for a dialog, the President said that the central domestic problems of our times "relate, not to basic clashes of philosophy or ideology, but to ways and means of reaching common goals—to research for sophisticated solutions to complex and obstinate issues." The idea implicit in this kind of statement is that economic problems should be left to technicians to solve without the emotional debate that has stirred the country in the past. The President himself doesn't always follow the rule: witness his impassioned plea for medicare. But, beyond this, it must be asked whether research and experts can really resolve basic issues without some kind of guidance. If experts are told to help solve the farm problem within the limits of freedom for the farmer, they will come up with one kind of solution. If they are given no directions they are all too apt to smuggle in their own values, and suggest some elaborate schemata of their own. It so happens that reliance on expertise has usually gone hand in hand with government planning of one kind or another. An expert who tells the government just to let things alone and let the free market take its course will not be earning his salary very long. The Russian Government is full of experts, precisely because it seeks to control every aspect of the economy.

There is nothing new, of course, about Government planning and interference with the market. Its famous practitioners can be

traced through history. The Emperor Diocletian, for instance, tried price controls in Rome. King Richard started England on its long experiment with the Corn Laws. One of the great planners was Colbert, minister to King Louis XIV. It was against Colbert and his school that Adam Smith revolted in his "Wealth of Nations" published in the same year as the Declaration of Independence. In the United States, also, planning has a history. It was not so long ago, in the thirties, that the Technocrats under Howard Scott were preaching that modern economic problems are too complicated for the politicians or the population, and should be left to engineers. At about the same time the historian Charles A. Beard was calling for a "single national authority" that would, among other things, fix a "standard of life budget" for the American people and implement it with the aid of production experts. And the idea of planning dominated the NRA, with its codes for controlling prices, wages, and output, which the well-remembered Gen. Hugh (Iron Pants) Johnson strove mightily to uphold. Fortunately the codes were finally declared unconstitutional.

One person who saw through this whole cult of planning very early and tried to change things to a more hopeful direction was President Kennedy's good friend, Walter Lippmann. In his wonderful book, "The Good Society," published in 1937, he made a devastating attack on the planners of his day, arguing that they had missed the central economic development of the modern world. That development was the division of labor, which requires that the specialized work of one man be coordinated with that of another, and that the production of both be somehow linked to the freely choosing consumer. Such coordination, Lippmann held, cannot possibly be achieved by government directives, and those who believe it can are in a literal sense reactionary. Rather, the division of labor necessitates the very market economy that planners scorn, and requires a government that rules by law rather than by arbitrary decree. Wrote Lippmann: "It is no accident that the division of labor, common laws, the ideal of equal justice, the restraint of prerogative and privilege . . . should all have evolved together in the same regions of the earth. They are merely different aspects of the momentous change in which men have been passing out of their primitive self-sufficiency into the intricate interdependence of the great society."

**THE VITAL CONNECTION**

These philosophic reflections are of immense importance in judging various tendencies and programs put forward in the name of the New Frontier. For if the philosophy of the good society is right, the trouble with the New Frontiersman is not that he is too radical, but that he has missed the bus—or shall we say the jet?—of modern history. In our day government must wield great power in the national defense, in the maintenance of internal law and order, in the provision of a sound and dependable currency system; the functions of government are not fixed and immutable. But the dynamic force of progress is the free collaboration of individuals made possible by the widening of the competitive market and the intricate functioning of the price, wage, and profit system. It is this system, not the directives of government, that creates wealth and work in the modern world. And it is this system, with its wide dispersion of power and decision, that serves as an indispensable buttress to human liberty.

The President has never given sufficient stress to this vital interconnection of political and economic liberty. While his administration has blown cold and hot toward businessmen as a group, it has not consistently upheld free-market principles. The admin-

newspapers and the other to U.S. News & World Report.

The two interviews dovetail, though they do not cover all of the same points. The Attorney General told David Kraslow, Washington correspondent of the Knight newspapers, that there had been no invasion plan completed during Mr. Eisenhower's term. He said: "There was just a general concept. The logistics and the details were worked out after the President [Kennedy] took office."

Added interest has developed now in this whole subject, because many of the Cuban officers of the invasion force, who were recently ransomed have been telling Americans that the United States had assured them of air cover. Attorney General Kennedy makes quite a point of the fact that "no U.S. air cover" was ever promised. Technically, this is correct. But the United States was fully cognizant of the air support the Cubans were supposed to have. Yet this was inadequate. Attorney General Kennedy said in his interview in U.S. News & World Report:

"The first point is that there was not U.S. air cover and none was withdrawn. In fact, the President didn't withdraw any air cover for the landing forces, United States or otherwise.

"What happened was this: One air attack had been made on Saturday on Cuban airports. There was a flurry at the United Nations and elsewhere and, as a result, U.S. participation in the matter was coming to the surface. This surfacing was contrary to the preinvasion plan. There was supposed to be another attack on the airports on Monday morning.

"The President was called about whether another attack which had been planned should take place. As there was this stir about the matter, he gave instructions that it should not take place at that time unless those having the responsibility felt that it was so important it had to take place, in which case they should call him and discuss it further. And that's what was postponed. It wasn't air cover of the beaches or landings. And, in fact, the attack on the airports took place later that day."

The air cover provided was from a base in Central America. What part the U.S. Government played in organizing it is not disclosed. In the middle of a military operation, however, you can't make a long-distance call to the White House and discuss the next move. The anti-Castro forces were sure air cover was coming from somewhere.

The Attorney General was asked who did the planning. He declared that "the plan that finally went into effect was approved by our military—the Pentagon, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as the Central Intelligence Agency." He added that, while the Joint Chiefs "approved" the plan, "the responsibility for the planning lay primarily with the CIA," and that, since the President had to give final approval to the plan, he had accepted the blame.

In both interviews, the Attorney General said that U.S. air power was to have been used only if the ships transporting the Cuban invasion force had been detected by Castro before they reached the target area and were attacked on the high seas on their way back to Central America. This is the explanation given for the presence of U.S. warships, including an aircraft carrier, in the vicinity of the Bay of Pigs on the day of the invasion. Yet it is asserted that before the invasion the President had "made it clear" that U.S. armed forces, including airpower, would not be used.

In the interview in the Knight newspapers, the Attorney General said, "The plan that was used was fully cleared by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

But what does "cleared" mean? Do the Joint Chiefs take responsibility for any such plan as was employed?

Listing the major "mistakes," Mr. Kennedy added: "There was not sufficient air cover at the beach. That was a mistake. There were not enough men and equipment. That was a mistake. Underestimating the T-33's (Castro's airplanes) that was a serious mistake. The planning was inadequate, just inadequate."

But who did all this planning, and why wasn't someone in the U.S. Air Force able to say in advance whether the T-33's had the capacity to carry rockets? These were the U.S. planes originally given to the Batista regime in Cuba.

The important "details" have never been divulged, as there has been a constant cover-up. But if Congress now fails to make a searching inquiry, with testimony available to the public, another military fiasco could occur, especially if the same "military planners" are still in command at the Pentagon or elsewhere.

#### REDS WILL FLOURISH IN CUBA AND EXPAND, ULBRICHT SAYS

(By William L. Ryan)

BERLIN, January 15.—East German Communist Leader Walter Ulbricht told world Communist chieftains today that communism will continue to flourish in Cuba and intends to extend itself in the Western Hemisphere.

With Soviet Premier Khrushchev listening from the platform, the spade-bearded East German denounced Red China's attacks on the Russian leader's policies. He credited him with saving the world from nuclear war by compromising the Cuban crisis with President Kennedy.

In his opening address to East Germany's Sixth Communist Party Congress, Mr. Ulbricht also proposed a vague solution for the problem of divided Berlin. He said the United Nations flag should replace the NATO flag in West Berlin, but that any such arrangement must recognize East German sovereignty, especially access routes on the land, water and in the air.

#### ASNS INDIAN SETTLEMENT

Mr. Ulbricht also called on Peking and India to settle their border dispute at once. He criticized the Chinese Reds for launching their border operation against India in October without consulting other Communist states.

Mr. Khrushchev's handling of the Cuban crisis, Mr. Ulbricht said, prevented the world from experiencing the horrors of nuclear war. Mr. Khrushchev nodded agreement.

Mr. Ulbricht maintained Mr. Khrushchev kept communism alive in Cuba and gave it an opportunity to spread in the Western Hemisphere.

"There was a compromise," he told the party congress. "President Kennedy had to abandon his idea of aggression. . . ."

"Cuba was freed of the threat of aggression and is now able to build up its country on the basis of socialism."

#### [From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star] LOW-LEVEL CUBA FLIGHTS DISCONTINUED BY UNITED STATES

(By Earl H. Voss)

The United States has ended low-level aerial reconnaissance of Cuba and now relies exclusively on high-flying U-2's to keep an eye on Soviet and Cuban military moves in the Caribbean, according to American officials.

It was new evidence gathered by U-2's that caused American analysts to raise their estimate of Soviet forces in Cuba from upwards of 10,000 to 16,000 to 17,000.

Soviet-manned anti-aircraft missile batteries in Cuba, which proved they can reach the unusual altitudes at which U-2's fly by knocking one out of the sky, are not now firing at the planes on their regular reconnaissance flights over the island.

The administration has not felt so sure, however, that the low-level Cuban anti-aircraft weapons, supplied by the Soviet Union but believed to be under Prime Minister Castro's control, would hold their fire indefinitely if low-level reconnaissance were continued on a daily basis.

For this reason, the low-altitude flights have been suspended. They could, of course, be resumed if U-2 or other intelligence tips should acquire it.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev apparently is hoping to set an example, by withholding fire on the U-2's, in avoiding a direct clash between Soviet and American military forces.

President Kennedy ignored this principle which the Kremlin apparently hopes to establish, when he discovered Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba. He interposed a U.S. naval blockade in the path of Soviet ships bound for Cuba.

The possibility of a clash between Soviet and American military forces again would be posed if there were an anti-Castro uprising in Cuba. The United States hardly could avoid a fight with Soviet forces if they tried to prop up Castro by crushing Cuban freedom fighters.

The range of other contingencies in which the United States might be forced to move against Soviet troops is being canvassed now.

President Kennedy's unwillingness to risk incidents between a low-level American plane and Castro-controlled anti-aircraft batteries indicates, however, that the administration wants to choose carefully the circumstances under which it again directly challenges Soviet military power, if this ever is found to be necessary.

#### Spending

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the October 1962 issue of Fortune magazine entitled "The Priority of Politics Over Economics," casts considerable light on the fallacies of the economic theories of the New Frontier. In its emphasis on Government planning and direction of the economy as well as on heavy Federal spending, the New Frontier economic theorists misunderstand the dynamic nature of the free-market economy and the intricate functioning of the price, wage, and profit system. It is this free system that creates wealth and economic progress, as well as serving as an indispensable buttress to individual liberty. Government must maintain institutions and a climate favorable to growth, but healthy economic growth cannot be imposed from the top down. It must grow from the bottom up.

The Kennedy administration appears to believe that Government spending and control can bring faster economic growth and solve our still serious unemployment problem. Since the last fiscal year of the Eisenhower administration, Federal expenditures have increased from \$76.5 billion to an estimated \$93.7 billion in fiscal 1963. Yet the economy is still afflicted with an unsatisfactory rate of economic growth and a very high level of 5.8 percent of the civilian labor force unemployed.

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A263

his experiments in calculating the speed of light. \* \* \*

Naturally, I did not obtain the full story of Oskar Hansen in the few days of my assignment at Hoover Dam. Even now, after nearly three decades, I still have not been able to absorb all the multitudinous details of his crammed and achievement studded career. Through those decades, though, I have learned enough to list him as the only genius I have known. \* \* \*

Then, before long, the desert interlude did indeed come to an end for all of us. Each went back to his own task, regretting that there were no more opportunities to participate in desert trips and campfire sessions. \* \* \*

Oskar returned to Virginia to take up other creative tasks. He acquired a vast tract of ground of tremendous historical and sentimental value, a mountain portion of the original Thomas Jefferson estate, across the highway from Monticello. He designed and largely built a futuristic structure containing delicate electric ovens for the gem work which he liked to do, such as enameling on gold with pulverized gems—a virtually lost art dating back past medieval times. \* \* \*

Included in the decorations were cacti of all kinds from the Arizona desert, nurtured in a huge solarium.

I heard of his works and his progress through various channels, but the years slipped by without the opportunity presenting itself for us to meet again. At last I heard that Oskar was embarked upon the most prodigious undertaking of his career. He had been granted a contract, by the Congress of the United States, to create a gigantic new figure of liberty for the top of the monument to the Alliance and Victory, at Yorktown, marking the successful conclusion of the American Revolution on the site of the last battle where General Cornwallis surrendered.

On a trip East I went to see Oskar in his studio to observe the almost unbelievable task of the carving of Liberty from two solid blocks of granite, one weighing 23,000 pounds, the other 11,489.

I asked him to put down in writing what Liberty meant to him. This is his reply, penned in the solarium amid the desert cacti:

"I like to remind you that the brute strength of this granite block from the primal crust of the earth which we quarried at Mount Airy is also the result of the thought and spirit of the Great Sculptor and was fashioned by His mind while 'darkness lay over the bosom of the deep.' A granite block is, therefore, more than just a large stone; it is a form of capital asset of the spirit, His spirit, which remains with us always.

"What is the face of Liberty? What character molds her features? On this Pantop Mountain in the Albemarle, on soil once hallowed by the feet of Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson, it is more likely that the true nature of Liberty may be perceived than on any similar spot on earth, outside Mount Sinai.

"The victory at Yorktown was a victory of the spirit. There is spirit in the face of the Liberty which will stand again at Yorktown.

"This figure of Liberty which I am bringing out of the granite is larger than Michaelangelo's David. One may accomplish, out of this 4-billion-year-old matrix, only that which has made a well-nigh indelible impression upon one's own mind.

"It is not completed, in a moment of sudden inspiration, with a line of the pencil or the stroke of a brush. Required is the iron will of a consistent and wholly dedicated purpose. Day by day and chip by chip, one must grow to the stature of the image one brings into form. The emotions which she may evoke in the beholder must be questioned in turn.

"When the Liberty of America again graces her shaft at York, it is my prayer that every American may search her face and find there the suggested presence of his own mother and of the mother of his sons. In the face of that reality men have ever sought reassurance for doing that which life requires and for the approval which shapes our conduct for that day when we may stand with clean hands and a shining face before the Great White Throne of God."

Hansen did not elaborate upon his mention of Michaelangelo's David, but he could have done so. Actually, "Liberty" was the largest single figure carving ever undertaken by one man alone in the history of the world, according to any historical records now known. Liberty measured 14 feet and 2 inches. Her completed weight was 25,000 pounds. She weighed much more than stated, in the rough.

When I heard Oskar speak of what Liberty meant to him, when I sensed the full force of his mental and physical powers going into the creation of the symbolic statue, I realized fully for the first time what genuine freedom has meant to Americans who have come here from other lands and gained citizenship in our Republic.

I went up to Washington from Oskar's studio and took time for a visit to the Smithsonian Institution.

At the entrance to the gem room I encountered the Arabian stallion.

It, too, spoke of Liberty in its own way. The proud, unconquered head burst upon view as the embodiment of freedom in the desert, the incarnate spirit of the untamed.

I closed my eyes and seemed to be transported at once to the brilliance of an Arizona day—to be surrounded by sun and sage, hearing the booming laugh of Oskar.

Then, once more, I gazed upon the stallion's head.

I knew a story about that piece of turquoise. \* \* \*

## J.F.K.: The Job Abroad

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, there is a most thoughtful editorial analysis of the President's state of the Union message in the January 15, 1963, edition of my hometown newspaper, the San Jose Mercury.

Under unanimous consent, I present the editorial for inclusion in the Record herewith and commend it to the attention of my colleagues and other citizens throughout the country:

## J.F.K.: THE JOB AHEAD

President Kennedy's state of the Union message lived up to its advance billing; it dwelt heavily on the necessity for a tax cut this year and for maintenance of cold war military strength.

This, it seems to us, reflects a reasonable reaction to the state of the world and of the Federal Union as they exist today, not as theorists might wish them to exist.

It is, of course, too early to criticize the President's program in detail; it hasn't been submitted in detail. But the hints contained in yesterday's state of the Union message provide reason for cautious optimism.

For example, President Kennedy appeared to recognize that congressional conservatives

will give his tax cut proposals short shrift unless there is a companion effort to reduce Federal spending. He promised, therefore, to keep domestic programs for next year under this fiscal year's spending levels. This is a step in the right direction.

It is also a step in the right direction when the President says, as he did in the state of the Union message, that labor pressure for a shorter workweek is inimical to economic growth and will not receive White House support.

In this regard, President Kennedy noted that his proposed net tax reduction of \$10 billion over the next 3 years would "mean tens of billions of dollars more each year in production, profits, wages, and public revenues."

"It would mean an end to the persistent slack which has kept unemployment at or above 5 percent for 61 out of 62 months—and an end to the growing pressures for such restrictive measures as the 35-hour week, which alone would increase hourly labor costs by as much as 14 percent, start a new wage-price spiral of inflation, and undercut our efforts to compete with other nations."

We concur most heartily in these sentiments.

We concur, too, in the President's observation that internal strife in the Communist world gives the West cause for hope which must be tempered with caution.

"A dispute over how best to bury the free world is no grounds for Western rejoicing," is the way the President put it. We agree.

In light of this, it is sensible that the budget to be submitted later this week contains an estimated \$50 billion for defense expenditures out of a \$99 billion total.

And the President spoke sense, too, when he in effect urged our NATO allies to concentrate on developing their own conventional forces as a complement to the U.S. nuclear strike capability. In the President's words:

"Threats of massive retaliation may not deter piecemeal aggression—and a line of destroyers in quarantine or a division of well-equipped men on a border, may be more useful to our real security than the multiplication of awesome weapons beyond all rational need."

Take it all in all, President Kennedy's state of the Union message is a hopeful statement.

All Americans hope the President's optimism proves to be justified. A more meaningful appraisal must await the details.

## Robert S. Kerr

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, the Honorable Robert S. Kerr, has left a deep mark on all of us.

This past session of the 87th Congress, all of us marveled at the stamina and skill of this great Senator as he directed the fate of the most important pieces of legislation to come to the floor of the other body.

There is no question that Bob Kerr was a self-made man, a go-getter. At times his foes sharply criticized his actions, but Bob Kerr feared no man.



He was, as one newsman wrote, "beyond doubt, the most powerful single Senator—and by himself more powerful than most of them in groups."

It did not take one long to know where Bob Kerr stood on a certain piece of legislation. All he needed was an explanation of the legislation and he would form his own opinion on its merits, and immediately would become its champion if he thought the bill was worthwhile.

This was brought home repeatedly in my own personal dealings with Bob Kerr. In the 1st session of the 87th Congress, Senator Bob Kerr, as chairman of the Public Works Committee, became one of the strongest advocates for the Delaware River Basin compact and helped lead the fight for its enactment by that body when it was threatened by a battle over public versus private power.

Outside of the Halls of Congress, Bob Kerr was a personable, knowledgeable individual who commanded the respect of a multitude of friends.

His every action was made in behalf of his constituents in that great State of Oklahoma, where he was born in a log cabin. His unique talents brought him widespread acclaim and his climb politically was compared with that of President Lincoln.

All of us, and the people of Oklahoma, will greatly miss this distinguished Senator. I join my colleagues in extending heartfelt condolences to Senator Kerr's devoted wife, Grayce Breene, and his daughter and three sons. Their grief is shared by all of us who had the good fortune and privilege to serve with this outstanding American.

### What Is the Administration Covering Up Regarding Our Foolish Policy in Cuba?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

#### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the news and editorials of the past several days are fraught with terror as to what is happening to the once powerful United States in our policy regarding Cuba. The President continues to tell the country what a great victory he has won there, but his brave words are followed by a rewriting of the historical record of what happened at the Bay of Pigs by his brother, the Attorney General, and by Communist boasts of how they took the United States in on the Cuban deal, and the worried questioning of talented newspapermen who are bringing to light that there was not indeed a victory in Cuba, but what may be a tremendous defeat. Mr. Speaker, I think it is imperative that Congress investigate our Cuban policy and demand of the administration a true statement of what has been accomplished and what we intend to do about increasing Soviet military expansion there.

As a part of these remarks, under unanimous consent, I would like to include a powerful column by Henry J. Taylor in the Dallas Morning News, an equally powerful piece by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star. I would also like to include the lead of a news article written by William L. Ryan, Associated Press staff writer in Berlin, in which the German Communist leader Walter Ulbricht tells of Communist plans for Cuba and the rest of the Western Hemisphere. Finally, to complete this dismal picture, I include a new article by Earl H. Voss, staff writer for the Washington Evening Star, telling of our abandonment of low-level aerial reconnaissance of Cuba. Mr. Speaker, in heaven's name, what is the administration trying to do?

The articles follow:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Jan. 21, 1963]

#### ABOUT SOVIET TROOPS—PENTAGON WHISPERS CUBA CONFESSION

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The Pentagon has whispered a confession; whispered it to achieve minimum notice and yet amend the rigged record in Washington's manipulated news.

This column repeatedly stated that throughout the White House campaign to call the Russians in Cuba "technicians," Mr. Kennedy knew these were heavily armored, fully equipped Soviet combat troops, more than 10,000 strong. Our Central Intelligence Agency had even identified the troops' shoulder patches. Our Moscow Embassy's military attaché had confirmed these designations as elite elements of the Red army. Moreover, Castro had (and still has) an estimated 144 missile launchers, 24 bascs, and at least 500 antiaircraft missiles, including many as "hot" and intricate as anything we possess.

Soviet submarine fishing base construction on the Isle of Pines, Segunaea Bay, continues apace. So does the military adaptation of the great Caverna de Santo Tomas, Caverna del Suisenor, Escaleras de Jaruco and Caguanes Caves, undetectable from the air.

#### MISSILES BEGAN ARRIVING IN 1961

In addition, the big missiles began arriving as early as November 1961—a fact the White House no longer denies but has never admitted.

Impeccable Cuban underground sources, dead right from the very beginning, still insist Khrushchev placed 88 long-range atomic missiles there, balanced against the 42 that the Pentagon "is sure" Khrushchev took out. But the whole charade was supported by the governmental brigade of tax-paid publicity agents pumping out misinformation like bouncing nymphs or charging Valkyries in yellow braids and 10-league boots.

That is what happened and that is the noisy side of the manipulated news technique. Now the manipulator's problem is to square up the noisy record as quietly as possible and thus ultimately challenge those who claim the public has been misled.

As the French would say, they have a sea to drink up.

Notice the method regarding the Soviet troops still in Cuba: No press release. No public statement. No leaks to "fill in" newsmen or a TV interview to bring the people closed to the Presidency. Why, even the state of the Union message reveals nothing about how Cuba remains a looming bastion fringed with fire or the downhill negotiations that still allow this result 90 miles from our shores.

#### HOW THE STORY SHIFTED

First was the White House insistence that there were no Soviet soldiers there. Then the President's, oh, well, perhaps there are "two or three thousand." Finally, months later, the Pentagon confirmation that the 10,000 was true. And now the Pentagon has been instructed to state, but only in reply to inquiries, that yes, Mr. Kennedy's estimate of Cuba-based Soviet combat forces is "somewhat higher than had been thought."

How much higher, you ask? Oh, quite a bit. The Pentagon's official admission as of the day of the President's State of the Union message is 17,000. That message stated "while danger continues, a deadly threat has been removed." Has it?

Moreover, Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester finally agreed to reveal that at least 20,000 Soviet soldiers were in Cuba at the hurry, hurry why? moment of lifting the blockade. By the Pentagon's own calculation less than 3,000 have left. Why?

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in turn, falls right in line with the whole news-manipulation program. Testifying before a Senate Foreign Relations Committee closed session on January 11 he kept up the same old charade—the hair-splitting fiddle-faddle that the President hadn't given a commitment not to invade Cuba. Stalwart Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, and KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, protested Mr. Rusk's "ambiguities."

#### CYCLE STARTS WITH RATIONALIZED LIE

The truth seldom bounds out of any political forest like a leaping deer. It must be sought. This is the function of the free press. And under the administration's manipulation policy it is admittedly impossible to accept even our highest officials' statements at face value.

The rationalized lie starts the cycle. Then the denial compounds the felony. Then the adjusted lie adds to the crime. Finally the ultimate confirmation that it was all false from the beginning is forced out only by exceedingly unfashionable persistence.

The Communists are ideologists but they are not idiots. Khrushchev, of course, knows the truth. The only people being fooled are the American people.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star] UNITED STATES AND THE BAY OF PIGS FIASCO—QUESTION OF MILITARY COMPETENCE OR CIVILIAN INTERFERENCE IS RAISED

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are entitled to know whether the Chiefs of their armed services are incompetent or whether, in strictly military operations, they are being interfered with by civilians in the Government.

A congressional investigation of just what happened before the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba took place in April 1961, is more than ever necessary now, because of what is being disclosed as the "true story" of the fiasco. For unless the responsibility of the U.S. Chiefs of Staff during military operations is clearly fixed, the capacity of the United States to prevent or resist armed attacks in this hemisphere may be open to question.

More than 300,000 men of our armed services were mobilized last October inside the United States for a possible invasion of Cuba in order to get rid of the Soviet missile bases there. But there is no way to judge whether the military Chiefs even then had the full authority to act and just what restrictions were placed upon them which could have affected the success of that expedition.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who, because he is a brother of the President, is regarded as the administration's authoritative spokesman in many matters outside his own department, has just given two interviews on the Cuban fiasco, one to the Knight